



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES¹

By TRUMAN MICHELSON

NOTES ON FOX VERBAL COMPOSITION.—I have tried to show in the "American Anthropologist" (N. S., 15: 473 *et seq.*) that the very great firmness in the verbal complex was more apparent than real. In the present paper I propose to emphasize a special feature which escaped me at the time; namely, that what I have termed "incorporation" should rather be called "loose composition," for it is desirable to restrict the word "incorporation" to such cases as lose their word-forming elements in the verbal complex. In the above-mentioned paper I have given some examples which clearly show that such elements are not lost in the Fox verbal complex; but, to bring this out more patently, it may be well to amplify the material. The examples are all taken from my unpublished texts, with a few exceptions which are from Jones's "Fox Texts." The phonetic system employed is that of Jones; but I should state, that, after several seasons' field-work with the Foxes, I am convinced that this system is inadequate in a number of important points. As long as this paper does not deal with purely phonetic problems, however, it is justifiable to use a known system rather than confuse the reader with a new transcription of the same language. The sections (§) referred to are those of the Algonquian sketch in the "Handbook of American Indian Languages." Jones's "Fox Texts"² and "Kickapoo Tales"³ are quoted respectively "J." and "J. Kickapoo," followed by reference to page and line.

A good illustration of this looseness in composition is *ä'pōnuwīpitwāwanaiyowātc'* THEN THEY CEASED USING THEIR TEETH. Observe that *uwipitwāwanⁱ* THEIR TEETH

¹ Printed with permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

² William Jones, Fox Texts (PAES 1).

³ William Jones, Kickapoo Tales (PAES 9).

occurs in the middle of a verbal complex, but suffers no elimination of the pronominal elements *u—wāwanⁱ* (§ 45) beyond that of the terminal *i*, which would be lost also if we had to deal with a verbal stem. The initial *ai* of the stem *aiyo* is responsible for this alone, exactly as is the initial *u* of *uwipitwāwanⁱ* for the loss of the terminal *i* of the stem *pōni* CESSATION (see § 16). Such a loss is not comparable with the elimination of terminal *w* of nouns before the possessive suffix *m*: e.g., *ketūgimāmenānAgⁱ*⁴ OUR [inclusive] CHIEFS (J. 62.22) as contrasted with *ugimāw^a* CHIEF, the ^a of which is a suffix showing that the noun is singular and animate; and with the denominative *ugimāw^a* HE WOULD HAVE BECOME CHIEF (J. 26.16), in which *i* is the copula, and ^{s^a is the verbal pronoun of the potential subjunctive third person animate singular (§ 30). Had we true cases like this in verbal complexes, we should call them "incorporations." Examples like *kī'u'tūgimāmipen^a* THOU SHALT BE CHIEF TO US (J. 8.3) do not count; for *tūgimām* is simply abstracted from the possessed noun, and then verbalized in the manner shown in the above-mentioned paper. A supposed case in which certain elements were thought to be eliminated (American Anthropologist, 15: 473) has turned out to be erroneous. The error was induced by two factors; namely, a mistrans-}

⁴ A word like *netūgimāma* MY CHIEF, reconstructed by myself, but absolutely certain in formation (cf. the Kickapoo vocative *netōgimāme* O MY CHIEF! [J. Kickapoo 86.17, 26]), would bring this out more clearly. The difference in the vowel-quantities, supported by Kickapoo, is unexplained.—The elimination of *w* before the possessive suffix *m* occurs also in Cree, Ojibwa, and Algonkin; very probably also in other Algonquian dialects. Lacombe has a completely wrong explanation. Owing to phonetic laws, the state of affairs in Ojibwa and Algonkin is largely disguised.

lation on the part of an interpreter, and a faulty phonetic restoration on my part.

In the paper mentioned above I also stated that incorporation of the nominal object did not occur.¹ It does not if we follow the argument of the preceding paragraph; we do find loose composition wherein the objective noun is in the midst of a verbal complex. The example of the preceding paragraph is absolutely parallel to *nepyätciketänesawâpamäpen^a* WE HAVE COME TO SEE THY DAUGHTER.² In this verbal complex, *ketañes^a* THY DAUGHTER is treated precisely as it would be in a sentence before a word beginning with a consonant. If I am asked to define under what circumstances the nominal object is within the verbal compound and when without it, I candidly admit I do not know, any more than I know under precisely what conditions particles, independent pronouns (see below), and so on, occur within or without the verbal complex. I say this, after going over hundreds of pages of Fox texts; and it is precisely this inability to define the conditions that leads me to believe in an extreme looseness of structure: that is, for the greater part there are no hard and fast rules.

To go on with examples. An example where a locative singular of a noun is in a verbal complex without losing the locative-making element is *pwāwaskutägipagise'kamän^e* THAT I DID NOT JAM MY FOOT IN THE FIRE (J. 306.21). Here *askutägi* IN THE FIRE is between two verbal stems.

The following are some cases in which independent personal pronouns are found in the heart of verbal compounds: *inictä'i wi'utcinänänatäpwe'tönäg^e* THAT VERILY IS WHY WE SHALL BELIEVE YOU (*nänän^a* WE

¹ For recent discussions of nominal incorporation in American Indian languages, see Boas, Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part I. (BBAE 40: 74, 75); Putnam Anniversary Volume, 436; Sapir, AA n. s., 13: 250-282; Kroeber, XVI Internat. Amerikanisten-Kongress, 569-576; AA n. s., 13: 577-584.

² See Journ. Wash. Acad. Sc., 4: 405.

excl., § 44), *ketcägimegukinwāwakegapihenepwäämētosäneniwite'käsoyägw^e* I HAVE PLACED IT ALL FOR YOU WHO ARE CALLED MORTALS (*kinwāw^a* YOU, § 44), *kiwicigimegune'kinwāwāpesetawipen^a* YOU ARE TO LISTEN VERY ATTENTIVELY TO US (*kinwāw^a* YOU, § 44). From these it appears that not only subjective, but objective, independent pronouns may occur in the midst of a verbal compound. It should be noticed that the presence of the independent pronouns does not in the least affect the verbal pronouns (for *-näg^e* see § 29; for *ke-nepw^a*, § 28; for *kī-ipen^a*, § 28). It is to be noted that in all cases a particle occurs before the independent pronoun. Whether this will turn out to be an unvarying rule, I do not know.

Instances of demonstrative pronouns occurring in verbal complexes without suffering the loss of such terminal elements as show animateness or inanimateness, and singularity or plurality, are: *kīcīnakānōne'kⁱ* AFTER THAT ONE HAS TOLD THEE (*kīci-*, *kanō-*, § 16; *īna*, § 47; *n*, § 21, but conventionalized [American Anthropologist, N.S., 15: 476]; *eto prevent -nk-*, § 8; *'kⁱ*, § 29); *kīcīnigutⁱ* AFTER HE WAS TOLD THAT (for *kīci-īni-i-gu-tcⁱ*; *kīci*, *i*, § 16; *īnⁱ* THAT, inanimate sing., § 47; *tcⁱ*, § 29); *kīcīnāt̄cimutⁱ* AFTER HE NARRATED THAT (for *kīci-īni-āt̄cimutⁱ*, and written correspondingly in the current syllabary; only an apparent exception to the above statement: the terminal *i* of *īnⁱ* is not lost, because it is in front of a verbal stem *per se*; it is elided because the stem begins with a vowel; it would be elided outside of a compound if the next word began with a vowel; the loss of *i* of *kīci* is referred to in § 16); *ä'pitcimanikīcägutisanganägwa'kⁱ* THAT THIS CONTINUES TO LOOK AS DIFFICULT AS POSSIBLE (*manⁱ* THIS, inanimate sing., § 47).

In the above-mentioned paper I have given some examples of indefinite pronouns being in the middle of verbal complexes. The point that I wish to emphasize is, that the terminal grammatical elements are treated

precisely the same as they would be outside of a compound, and that whatever phonetic changes they suffer is not due to intimate association in the compound. Thus *uwīyā'a* SOMEBODY (§ 48) becomes *uwīyā'a*, because the stem *kaski* ABILITY begins with a consonant. Similarly Kickapoo *awiyāhi* SOMETHING retains the terminal *i* to show that the form is inanimate singular (J. Kickapoo, 127). A less clear case is Fox *wī'pwāwūwīyā'anā'kwamataminic'* THAT NO ONE WOULD BE SICK. This stands for *wī'pwāwi-uwīyā'anā'kwamataminic'*. The elision of *i* in both instances is due to ordinary euphonic rules. The difficulty is, that in the sentence it is necessary to carefully distinguish identity and difference in the third person, a well-known feature of Algonquian languages. Hence it is that *uwīyā'a* needs an obviative, which is *uwīyā'anī*. The obviatives of indefinite pronouns are not discussed in the Fox sketch in the "Handbook of American Indian Languages," but they exist; exactly as do obviatives of demonstrative pronouns, pointed out by me elsewhere (J. Kickapoo, 127). The formation is exactly the same as in animate nouns. Note that terminal *anī* loses its *i* because a vowel immediately follows, and for no other reason. For *wī'-aminitc'*, see §§ 29, 34; *t*, § 21; *pwāwi*, below, p. 54; *ā'kwama* is the stem, meaning SICK. Another example is *ā'pwāwigämegupuwīyā'anikaskipyānutaminic'* IT IS INDEED SAID THAT NO ONE SUCCEEDED IN REACHING IT (a wigwam). In this case the terminal *i* of *uwīyā'anī* has become full-sounding, as a consonant immediately follows. A brief analysis of the whole compound is: *ā'-aminitc'*, §§ 29, 34; *pwāwi*, an original verbal stem which in Fox is used as a modal negation; *gā* and *megu*, particles of weak meanings; *p* for *pi*, a quotative (cf. § 41); *kaski* ABILITY, *pyā* MOVEMENT HITHERWARD, both well-known verbal stems (§ 16); *nu*, a verbal stem of no independent existence; the combination *pyānu* means REACH.

The inclusion of particles and adverbs within verbal compounds has been sufficiently illustrated in the above-mentioned paper. I may add, however, that it would be an easy matter to give almost unlimited examples.

Formerly I could give but two examples of verbal compounds included within other verbal compounds. To these I now add *ā'pwāwimegunanācima'katäwinō'i'netc'* HE NEVER WAS TOLD, "FAST." This stands for *ā'-pwāwi-megu-nanāci-ma'katäwinō-inetc'*; *ma'katäwinō* is a rhetorical lengthening of *ma'katäwin*" (see § 6); the imperative sentence is in the midst of another sentence. For *-nū* see § 31; *ā—etc'*, § 41; *pwāwi*, as above; similarly *megu*; *nanāci*, an adverb, used apparently only with negatives, with the combined sense of NEVER; *i*, § 16; *n*, § 21, but conventionalized in meaning.

This leads me to discuss a new type of verbal composition; namely, where, from our point of view, Fox has a sentence within a verbal compound, which, from the Fox point of view, is quite distinct from the type above. An example is *kekicimeguyōwenepowänemenepenā* WE INDEED ALREADY THOUGHT YOU WERE DEAD. This stands for *ke-kici-meguyōwe-nep-o-w-äne-m-e-nepenā*: *kici* and *megu* have been explained above; *yōwe* is an adverb meaning IN THE PAST, *äne* is a stem which, so far as known, cannot occur independently, and has the meaning MENTAL ACTIVITY (§ 18); *m* is used simply to transitivize the verb (§ 37); *e* is to prevent the combination *mn*; *ke-nepenā* are the subjective and objective pronominal elements (§ 28); *nep* is a verbal stem of considerable independence, meaning TO DIE; I cannot as yet give the value of *o*, but we find *nepohīwā* as well as *nepwā*, apparently both with the same meaning; the *w* is also unexplained, but see p. 53. In the combination, *nep* is simply an object clause. An example almost the same as the above is *wätci nepowänemēnāgē* WHY WE THOUGHT YOU WERE DEAD. For *-nāgē*, the pronominal elements, see § 29. On the same order is

kīcikigānowänemagⁱ I THOUGHT THEY HAD COMPLETED THEIR CLAN-FEAST: *kīci*, *äne*, and *m* have been explained above, and *w* has been referred to; *Agⁱ* is a termination of the conjunctive mode showing that *I* is the subject and THEM (animate) the object; *kīgānu* is a verbal stem TO HOLD A CLAN-FEAST. Observe that no subjective pronouns in the object-clause are expressed. In a way, it resembles accusative and infinitive construction in Latin indirect discourse. Nearly allied is *nepecigwänemegōtug^e* HE PROBABLY THOUGHT ME UPRIGHT. The analysis is: *ne—gō* for *ne—gw^a* (§ 28) before the affix *tug^e* PROBABLY, the phonetics are not treated in the Fox sketch; *äneme*, explained above; *pecigw* for *pecigwi* before a vowel; *pecigwi* means UPRIGHT in the moral sense. Compare *kepecigwiticāmegumaniwītämōnepw^a* I TRULY INDEED TELL YOU THIS UPRIGHTLY, a compound of the type discussed above (*tcā*, *megu*, *mani*, included within a verbal compound; *ke—nepw^a*, § 28; *amō*, § 34; stem probably *wī*, not *wit* as in § 16; *t*, § 21), and *pecigwimegw^a* me'tosäneniwigwāni WHOSOEVER LIVES UPRIGHTLY.

Another novel type of composition is *cāgwänemowināgwatwⁱ* IT SEEKS THAT THEY ARE UNWILLING: *cāgw*, UNWILLING, § 16; *äne*, MENTAL ACTIVITY, § 19; *mo*, §§ 21, 40; *wⁱ* is the inanimate singular pronoun of the independent mode, § 28; *nāgwat* cannot be analyzed in a completely satisfactory manner, but it is evident that it is to be connected with a stem *nāgu* APPEARANCE, LOOK (§ 18), which apparently cannot occur in initial positions; and at the same time the posterior portion resembles the copula *gwat*, § 20; it is possible that *nāgwat* is for **nāgugwat* (cf. § 13); but it is also possible that we have a copula *at*, for all inanimate copulas are not given in § 20 (for instance, *t* in *myānetwⁱ* IT IS BAD as contrasted with *myānesiw^a* HE IS BAD); and it will be noted that the animate copula *si* goes with *nāgu*. [Ojibwa has a formation that corresponds exactly to *nāgwat*. April, 1917.] Note

that *cāgwänemo* starts out just as if animate intransitive verbal pronouns were to be immediately suffixed, whereas none are. The element *wi* is at present completely obscure, though it may be cognate to the *w* mentioned above, and compare the *w* in two examples below. Observe, furthermore, that a verbal stem is found farther on in the compound, which is quite contrary to the ordinary views of Algonquian grammar. The two examples referred to above are *wītacimamātumowāpičⁱ* HE SHALL SIT IN WORSHIP THERE and *mamātumowāwitähätcⁱ* HE IS PRAYERFUL IN FEELING. We cannot tell whether the element is *w* or *wi*; for the *i*, in any case, would be elided before the *a* of *api* TO SIT (§ 16) and *itä* TO FEEL (§ 18). The analysis otherwise is *wī—tcⁱ*, § 29; *taci* THERE, § 16; *ma*, § 25; *mātu* PRAY, a verbal stem of considerable independence, § 16; *mo*, §§ 21, 40; *api*, a verbal stem of considerable independence, § 16; *itä*, a verbal stem of apparently limited position, § 18; *tcⁱ*, § 29; *hä*, a connective stem, practically a copula, § 20. Observe that both these compounds start out as if animate intransitive verbal pronouns were immediately to follow, whereas they do not; and other verbal stems occur farther on in the compounds, which are the same anomalies as those referred to above.

Yet another novel type of composition is *kewīticitcāmegutäpesimenepw^a* I AM INDEED TRULY HAPPY WITH YOU. The inclusion of the particles *tcā* VERILY, TRULY, and *megu*, is of the type discussed above. The analysis of the other elements is: *ke—nepw^a*, the subjective and objective pronouns of the entire complex, § 28; *wī*, initial stem, meaning ASSOCIATION; *tcⁱ*, the same element as appears in conjunction with *pyä* (*pyätcⁱ*), *sägi* (*sägitci*), etc., the exact meaning of which is unknown, and probably is conventionalized in use; *täpe*, an initial stem HAPPY; *si*, the copula, § 20; *m*, to transitivize the verb, § 37; *e*, to prevent the combination *mn*, § 8. Observe that in this compound we have the copula immediately before the transitivizing suffix.

I think that the explanation is that *täpesi* is taken as a unit. This is confirmed by *kīwü-pesihihegōgi* THEY WILL SET YOU CRAZY, J. 308.21 (*kī-gōgi*, § 28; *sī*, apparently for *si*; *hi*, § 20; *h*, §§ 21, 37; *e*, § 8). In this compound also the copula precedes the transitivizing suffix. For *täpesi* and *wäpesi*, note *ä'täpesiwätc'* THEY WERE HAPPY (*ä-wätc'*, § 29), *nekatawiwäpes'* I HAVE ALMOST GONE CRAZY, J. 308.18 (*ne-*, § 28; *katawi* ALMOST).

THE POSITION OF THE FOX VERBAL STEM *kaski* ("ABILITY").—In the "American Anthropologist" (N. S., 15: 475) I stated that the Fox verbal stem *kaski* could not occur outside a compound. I have just discovered from a text recently collected that it can do this very thing: thus, *kī'uwīgipwameg' kaski nōtegi* YOU (pl.) WILL BE ABLE TO LIVE THERE WHEN IT IS WINDY.

REMARKS ON THE PHONETIC ELEMENTS OF FOX.—On p. 50 I stated that I do not consider Jones's phonetic scheme adequate for the Fox dialect. Our chief points of difference are: that I hear aspirations before all initial vowels and diphthongs, after all terminal voiceless vowels, and after all vowels when followed by sibilants; long vowels for short, and *vice versa*; *ō* for *ū* always; sometimes *o* for *u*; always *u* for *o* initially and terminally, rarely otherwise; but one sound (') for *h* and ' ; *ck* always for *sk*; surd stops as glides after sonant stops when immediately preceding terminal voiceless vowels which are at the same time aspirated; a voiceless *w* after stops in the same position; surd *m* and *n* as glides after *m* and *n* respectively in the same positions; a fricative that begins as a sonant stop, gliding into a surd fricative, for *tc* when preceding the terminal voiceless aspirated vowels, and in a few other cases; glides for Jones's inverted periods; the main accent in different positions; 'ä'- (Jones ä'-) and *wi'*- everywhere in verbal complexes, and not solely before *k*, *t*, *p*.

A SECOND NOTE ON FOX PWĀWI.-.—In the "American Anthropologist" (N. S., 15: 364) I pointed out, that, from the evidence of Kick-

apoó, we must consider Fox *pwāwi*-, the negative particle of the conjunctive and certain other subordinate modes, to be a primary stem. At the time I overlooked the fact that the published Cree, Ojibwa, and Algonkin material also supported this view (see Lacombe, under *pwā* [*être impissant*], etc.; Baraga, under *bwāma*, etc.; Lemoine, under *incapable* [*pwā-*, *pwa-*, *pwāwi*-]; Cuq, under *pwa-*, *pwāwi*-). I may add that Ojibwa *ninbwāma* I CANNOT PREVAIL UPON HIM is to be analyzed thus: *nin-a*, the subjective and objective pronominal elements; *bwā*, the primary stem; -*m*-, the instrumental particle DONE WITH THE MOUTH, with animate object. Evidently the *wi* of Fox *pwāwi*- and Algonkin *pwāwi*-, *pwāwi*-, needs further elucidation. Shawnee *pwā-*, the equivalent of Fox *pwāwi*-, sheds no light on the problem, owing to the phonetics of that language.

REMARKS ON THE PHONETICS OF THE GULL LAKE DIALECT OF OJIBWA.—The material from which these notes are taken was gathered about two years ago from a single informant; namely, William Potter, at that time sixty-one years old. The informant was nearly a full-blooded Indian, and spoke but broken English. We may therefore presume that his pronunciation is characteristic of the dialect. These notes are assembled here in the belief that they will be of interest, and stimulate others to note peculiarities of the various Ojibwa dialects. They are not exhaustive, and other points in the phonetics of this dialect may surely be found out by a protracted study; for a half-hour with the informant was all that was possible, owing to his own pressing business in Washington. Some features of the Gull Lake dialect are thus far quite unique, not occurring in the dialects of Bois Fort or Fort William or Leech Lake, to judge from the texts of William Jones and De Jong. It is to be hoped that Radin's texts may be published soon, that the phonetics may be compared with those of the Gull Lake dialect.

1. *Glottal Stop.*—The glottal stop is often found where other writers have recorded nothing. Examples are *nickā'disi^e* HE IS ANGRY, *minōnā'gusi^e* SHE IS GOOD-LOOKING. The glottal stop doubtless is a relic of the personal pronoun,—Fox *-w^a* in Jones's transcription; or *-w^{a'}*, as I think correct. The *si* in both cases is the copula.

2. *Weakly Articulated Vowels.*—Long vowels at times are followed by corresponding weakly articulated short vowels which are voiced, not voiceless. At present I cannot formulate a rule governing the usage. Examples are: *sī,bi'* RIVER, *pimuse^e* HE WALKS PAST, *nā_ana'^an* FIVE, *mī,dā'^ac* AND, *wā'_abāñg'* TO-MORROW, *wī,nad^e* IT IS DIRTY. Something like this apparently occurs in the dialects of Bois Fort and Fort William.

3. *The Correspondent to 'k of Other Dialects.*—The 'k of other Ojibwa dialects goes back to a sibilant followed by a palatal surd stop. In the Gull Lake dialect we have a marked aspiration, followed by a glottal stop and then a surd stop, which is certainly velar as compared with English *k*, but not as pronounced as the surd velar stop of the Northwest-coast Indian languages. Probably it is akin to the corresponding Paiute sound. Examples are, *a'^aqi'* GROUND, *ma'^aqwa* BEAR.

4. *Terminal Aspirations.*—Terminally after stops I hear very distinct aspirations. It is very probable that sonant stops glide into surds before the aspiration, as is the case in Potawatomi, but I find that I have not recorded the glide in most cases. In Fox, sonant stops always glide into surds before terminal vowels which are both voiceless and aspirated. We may therefore conclude that the phenomenon is old. Examples from the Gull Lake dialect are, *ma'^aqwa^{k^e}* BEARS, *wī,nad^e* IT IS DIRTY, *mā^a'jimāgwa^{d^e}* IT SMELLS BADLY.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.—The miscellany presented here deals with a number of novel points in Algonquian philology, which are assembled in the belief that, as our knowledge

is so woefully deficient, it is suitable to promptly publish any new facts that are firmly established. I have adhered to Jones's Fox phonetic scheme for the reasons set forth on p. 50.

The Change of n to c.—In the "American Anthropologist" (N. S., 15:470 *et seq.*) and "Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences" (4:403) I have shown that *n* becomes *c* before *i*, which is either a new morphological element or the initial sound of such an element in Fox, Potawatomi, Ojibwa, and probably in Shawnee. From my last summer's field-work this last is amply confirmed. I also find, from my early work with the Menominee, that we have the same or an allied phenomenon (*s* for *c*) in that dialect. From the material contained in the works of Cuoq and Lemoine, it is patent that in Algonkin we have the same or a similar phenomenon (e.g., *mikaj* BATS-LE, in which a final *i* has been lost, as shown by Fox, etc.). From my work in Peoria last summer, it is evident that the same phenomenon occurs in that dialect, but apparently a preceding original *i* cancels the law. The *n*, of course, is replaced by *l*. Examples are: *mä'ci't^a* HE WHO COPULATED WITH ME (stem *ma*; vowel-change, as the form is a participle; *-it^a* HE—ME) as contrasted with *malitūtāwāⁿ* LET US COPULATE (*i*, to prevent the combination *lt*; *tī*, sign of the reciprocal, as in Fox, etc.; *tāwāⁿ*, the termination of the intransitive first person inclusive of the imperative, corresponding to Fox *tāw^e*); *pī'ci't^a* HE WHO BROUGHT ME (stem *pī*, for older *pyā* [Fox *pyä*], hence not contradicting the law; *c*, the instrumental particle DONE BY THE HAND, owing to the action of the law; *i* for *i* before sibilants); *pī'ciⁿ* BRING THOU HIM (*iⁿ*, THOU—HIM of the imperative mode, Fox *i*); *pī'cī'yāñg^{kii}* YE BROUGHT US (*iyāñg^{kii}*, YE—US of the conjunctive mode [Ojibwa *iiāng*, from Baraga; Algonkin *iiang*, from Lemoine]); *kipī'cīmwaⁿ* YE BROUGHT ME (*ki*—*imwaⁿ*, the pronominal elements for YE—ME in the independent mode [Ojibwa and

Algonkin *ki-im*, from Baraga and Lemoine; see also folder at end of RBAE 28]; *pī'ciwā'-kitce* THEY MUST BRING ME (*iwā'kitce*, the pronominal elements for THEY—ME in the potential mode; apparently Fox has the medial portion in a reversed order; Kickapoo apparently agrees with Peoria),—all as contrasted with *kipilāmī'na"* WE BROUGHT THEM (*ki-āmina"*, the pronominal elements for WE [inclusive]—THEM [animate] of the independent mode [Potawatomi has a similar termination: see RBAE 28:267]; *l* is the instrumental particle DONE BY THE HAND); *pīlatcī'* THOU BROUGHTEST THEM (*atcī'* THOU—THEM [animate] of the conjunctive mode; compare the equivalents in Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo, and Shawnee); *pīle'kō'* BRING YE HIM (*e*, to prevent a consonantic cluster foreign to the language; *kō* are the pronominal elements for YE—HIM of the imperative mode [Fox '*kū*']); *nimbilā'* I BROUGHT HIM (*nim—ā'* are the elements for I—HIM of the independent mode; *b*, regularly for *p* after a nasal). The action of original *ī* nullifying the law when it immediately precedes the consonant is illustrated by *mīlīlō'* GIVE THOU ME (Fox *micin"*) as contrasted with *nimi'lā'* (Fox *nemīnāw"*) I GAVE HIM. Note also *mīlī'tā'* HE THAT GAVE ME as compared with *pī'ci'rā'*. This proves that Fox *yā* after consonants is more original than Peoria *ī*. The same contraction takes place in Ojibwa and Menominee. Besides establishing the fact that Fox *e* and *i* are more original than Ojibwa *i* (see the papers cited above), the law shows that the terminal vowels in Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, Shawnee, and Peoria, which are lacking in Ojibwa, etc., are more primitive, as I previously inferred from the evidence of Montagnais (see RBAE 28:247).

The Interchange of ā and ā.—At the end of § 11 of the Algonquian sketch in the "Handbook of American Indian Languages" I pointed out that *ā* and *ā* interchange in Fox under unknown conditions: e. g., *pyāw"* HE COMES, *pyān"* COME, *ā'pyālcī'* WHEN HE CAME, etc. The same phenomenon

naturally occurs in Sauk and Kickapoo. From my early Shawnee notes (collected in the summer and fall of 1911) and recent (summer and fall of 1916) work with Peoria, I find that we have the same phenomenon in both these dialects, though it is disguised in Peoria owing to phonetic laws. Examples are, Shawnee *pyāw"* HE COMES, *pyātē* IF HE COMES. As pointed out above, *yā* after consonants in Peoria contracts to *ī*, and so we find the variation *ī* and *yā*. An example is *pīw"* HE COMES as compared with *kipyāmwa"* YE COME, *pyātci* WHEN HE CAME, *pyā'kitce'* HE MUST COME.

The Conjunctive of the Independent Passive with Obviatives as Subjects.—The conjunctive of the independent passive with obviatives as subjects is not touched upon in the Algonquian sketch in the "Handbook of American Indian Languages." For *-etcī* we have *-metcī*. Examples are, *ā'inemetcī* THEY WERE TOLD, *ānesemetcī* *ugyānī* *Acāha'* HIS MOTHER WAS SLAIN BY THE SIOUX, *utāneswāwa'* *āmenemetcī* THEIR DAUGHTERS WERE CAPTURED. In the examples given, terminal vowels have not been elided before initial ones, that the point at issue may not be obscured.

THE LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF MOHEGAN-PEQUOT.—The material upon which I base my classification is contained in the articles by Speck and Prince in Volumes 5 and 6 of the "American Anthropologist," N. S. In my "Preliminary report on the Linguistic Classification of Algonquian Tribes" (RBAE 28) I left the affiliations of this dialect undecided. Prince and Speck (*l.c.* 5:195) say: "Pequot, a dialect which shows a more striking kinship with the idiom of the Rhode Island Narragansetts and with the present speech of the Canadian Abenakis than with the language of the Lenni Lenape Mohicans . . . it seems probable either that the Pequot-Mohegans were only distantly akin to the Mohicans of the Hudson River region, or that the Pequots had modified their language to a New England form during the years of their

migration into Connecticut. The former theory is the more likely of the two." At the time, hardly more could be said. Since then, however, enough material has been gathered to definitely settle the question. The tables in my "Preliminary Report" show clearly that Canadian Abenaki and Natick do not belong closely together; and the evidence that Narragansett linguistically belongs with Natick is quite conclusive. A few summers ago I was able to gather a few texts and a vocabulary of the Mohicans of the Hudson River region, which I hope will soon be published; and this new material, together with similar material published by Prince in Volume 7 of the "Anthropologist," N. S., establish firmly the conjecture of Prince and Speck that Pequot and Mohican are not closely related, though, as I shall show later on, Mohican is more closely related to Pequot than it is to Delaware-Munsee, contrary to the prevalent belief. I think the following facts prove that Mohegan-Pequot belongs with the Natick division of Central Algonquian languages: a

sibilant is retained before *k*, *q*, but lost before a dental stop¹ (*squaaw* WOMAN; *metoog* TREE); the inanimate plural ends in *sh* (*nish* THOSE); the verbal pronouns of the independent mode for I—THEE are *g—sh* (*germeesh* I GIVE THEE); the verbal pronoun of the imperative mode for the second person singular is a sibilant (*beush* COME, *cowish* GO TO SLEEP). These features are characteristic of Natick (see RBAE 28: 272–275; and Eliot, in the Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 2d ser., 9). From the scanty material available, it would seem that Mohegan-Pequot is a *y* dialect, thus agreeing with Narragansett, rather than a dialect in which *n* at times is totally eliminated, as Prince and Speck would have it. However, this is a minor point.

TRUMAN MICHELSON

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

¹ Where a sibilant is retained before a dental stop, a medial vowel has been lost; e.g., *wüstü* HE MADE=Fox 'A'ci'tōw^a'; cf. Ojibwa *uji* TO MAKE. (The etymology of *wüstü* was previously unknown.)